QUESTION FOR ANSWER ON THE DAY.

(but not taken up)

Supply of Electric Power to Puttur and *en route* Villages in South Kanara District.

Q.—192. Sri K. VENKATA-RAMANA GOWDA (Puttur).—

Will the Government be pleased to state :—

(*a*) whether they have proposed to take up the scheme for extension of supply of electricity from Mangalore to Puttur and surrounding villages ;

(*b*) if so, the probable date when power will be made available in Puttur ?

A.—Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Minister for Public Works).—

(*a*) Yes.

(*b*) December 1958, subject to availability of line materials, etc.

Election to Board of Industries

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have to make an announcement. The election to the Industries Board has been postponed. I will fix the programme later on.

Member's representation

Sri V. P. DEENADAYALU NAIDU (Cubbonpet).—Sir, you were good enough to tell us some time ago that we were trying an experiment in this question hour. At the right and appropriate time when we are about to follow up any question, the procedure that we have adopted prevents us from getting our ideas completely cleared or getting full information, even though the Governmentis in a position to furnish us the best of information. If one is allowed to exhaust his questions, we will be able to get all the information and perhaps that will reduce the number of supplementaries. At the same time, we will make up for the loss of time resulting from our getting up, putting the question and sitting down. The purpose of the question Hour, if I understand it correctly, is to get the best of information. I was just watching a few members putting questions and when we were about to get the best of information, we were shut out from it because immediately the next man has been given an opportunity to put the supplementary. I only place this before you to consider or reconsider whether it would not be appropriate for us to go back on the procedure so that when one desires to have an interpellation, he may exhaust it fully. By that, we will have continuity as well as complete information about these questions.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What I am, at present, doing is, I am following the Lok Sabha practice. In Lok Sabha, in fact, on very important questions not more than five supplementaries are allowed, and on any other question, one or two supplementaries are allowed. I have gone thoroughly into the question and I find that I am allowing not less than 11 supplementaries to each question on an average. You will thus find that I have been more liberal. Suppose I allow the Hon'ble Member who tables a question to exhaust his supplementaries and then proceed to give chance to other members, then probably the number of supplementaries will increase to 20 to 25. Of course, if it is an important question, I do allow more supplementaries and an important question in this House has taken not less than 10 or 15 minutes and sometimes even half an hour. This being so, I am not in a position to accept the proposition of my friend Sri Deenadayalu Naidu. But I agree with him in this respect that I must give the person who tables a question a fair chance of putting the supplementaries. I have been doing that and if the supplementaries in the case of a person who tables the questions are about 20 or 25, it will be quite impossible for me to allow such a large number of supplementaries. After all, if the Hon'ble Members want to know exactly what is being done in the Lok Sabha, I can quote from the

Lok Sabha proceedings. Today I was looking into it and I could have also read relevant portions in detail in this House, but I did not know that this question will crop up today itself. I propose to give an exhaustive history of the supplementaries in the Lok Sabha later on.

*Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA (Krishnarajanagar).—I wish to add this. What Sri Dheendayal Naidu meant was not that the time was insufficient but, he only represented that the member asking the supplementary would sit down anticipating the answer from the Minister, and immediately, in view of the answer given by the Minister, the member would like to ask a further supplementary to make himself clear, but by that time a member at his back would be called upon and this would create a certain amount of inconvenience and therefore, Sri Deenadayal Naidu, if I understand him aright, appealed to the Chair to adopt the old custom of giving two or three chances to the member tabling the question, before calling upon another member to put supplementaries.

Mr. SPEAKER.—What I meant was that the Hon'ble Member who tabled the question would be given an opportunity to put certain number of supplementaries, and then go to other members. But in the end I come back to him and permit him a few more supplementaries. The Hon'ble Members may look into the records—I have come back to him after going round and given him a fair chance at the end to exhaust his supplementaries. I have not been able to understand why there should be any inconvenience in this particular system. It has been followed in the Lok Sabha and in the rest of the Assemblies in the country. There it does not cause any inconvenience. Why it should cause inconvenience particularly in this House I cannot understand. I have been very careful in calling the person who tables the question, at the end. I do call him in every case. Only in cases which are of a very simple nature, I do not call him if the Hon'ble Member who tables the question does not stand up.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—The nature of the inconvenience is this. I will have put in a supplementary and the Minister answers it and before I have the chance of putting another supplementary in view of the answer given, somebody else is called. At that time I will be getting up and sitting down, trying to catch the eye of the Speaker. That is the difficulty. It is an awkward situation for the member and for the Speaker.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Of course, standing and sitting down may mean some inconvenience to the members. When we become members of this Assembly, we have to put up with certain inconveniences. That cannot be helped. In fact, standing and sitting down will give a lot of exercise. That will be good. Apart from that, the only inconvenience that has been caused by my procedure is that the Hon'ble Members have not yet accustomed themselves to it. Once they get accustomed to it, they will say this is good.

Sri H. M. CHANNABASAPPA.—This can be avoided.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Let us try the experiment for some time more. If you find, that it is inconvenient, by experience then let us revise it. It is not in convenient to members in other Assemblies inlcuding Parliament. I have visited the Parliament and seen the system working satisfactorily.

Sri M. RAMAPPA (Harihar).—I request the Chair to give preference to those who are connected with the area. It is better to give preference to those members who belong to the local area.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I always do like that. I give chnaces to those persons who table local questions, to put the supplementaries in numbers; but even the local questions, it is found, become general and so many supplementaries are put by persons who are not connected with the local question. Then it becomes very difficult for me to control. But, it is difficult for me to stop Hon'ble Members from putting questions as it would mean interference with their right.

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Palaiyam).—At times we rise at 7, 7-30 or 8 P.M. when it is dark. Then it is very difficult for us to get down the steps and pass through, as it is utterly dark and no electric lights are provided. There is every probability of members slipping and falling down or falling one upon another. I would request that electric lights be provided where we have to pass through.

Mr. SPEAKEAR.—That is a real grievance. I will look into it.

Sri V. S. PATIL (Belgaum I).—On the point with regard to putting supplementaries raised by Sri Deenadayal Naidu. . . .

Mr. SPEAKER.—Why did you not make any representation before ?

Sri V. S. PATIL.—I stood four times, but I could not catch your eye.

Mr. SPEAKER.—So I caught you after the fourth time.

Sri V. S. PATIL.—As you know, in Bombay, when questions were sent by the members, to all those questions answers were given and thus we could save the time in asking supplementaries. Here I find that if I send one question, dividing it into 16 clauses, only three are admitted. So I will have to ask the remaining thirteen and that will take the time of the House. So, I request the Chair not to cut down the questions. When we are putting supplementaries, the supplementaries will go on extending like Hanuman's tail. If our questions are not cut down, it will not only save the time of the House, but also we can get all the information that it will be possible for the Hon'ble Ministers to give, which will be placed on the table of the House. Even on the parliamentary procedure regarding supplementaries, rule 33 says :

> " Any member may with the permission of the Speaker put a supplementary question for the purpose of further elucidating any matter of fact regarding which an answer has been given :
>
> " Provided that the Speaker shall disallow any supplementary question if, in his opinion, it infringes the rules as to the questions or if a sufficient or reasonable number of supplementary questions has already been put in respect of the principal question. "

In this case, simply because the number of questions is greater, that won't be in the fitness of things, in order to elucidate information, to cut them off or not to allow them. If it infringes any rule, the member can be prevented from asking the question, but when we require the information and the information is with the Government, why should we be blocked ? Simply because the number is great, that would not be a ground for disallowing the questions, because we come here to get all the necessary information from the Treasury Benches. So I submit that in order to avoid waste of time as well as to get all the information that it is possible to give, we may be allowed to put lengthy questions or a number of questions, and answers to all those questions should be obtained from the Government.

Mr. SPEAKER.—As regards the mode of admitting questions, the practice here in this House as well as in other Assemblies and Parliament in the Loka Sabha and Rajya Sabha is different from that of Bombay. In Bombay, Hon'ble Members, as Sri V. S. Patil knows, used to ask questions covering 13, 14, 16 clauses. Such a thing is not done here and also in other places. Here it is specifically understood that a question should be as short as possible, should not consist of more than three or four clauses. When a question of the type covering 20 clauses is given, naturally the office cuts them into so many parts, divides them into different questions. This is exactly what is done in other Assemblies including the Parliament. This is also the mode in the old Mysore Legislative Assembly. That being so, I cannot in any way adopt the procedure that was adopted in Bombay, because I find this is a much better procedure.

The second point is that the supplementaries must be allowed as far as possible. I have been allowing about 15 supplementaries in some cases, not

less than 11 supplementaries in each case. This being so, the Hon'ble Member Sri V. S. Patil should have no grievance. I do not believe that if a question covers over 15 or 20 clauses or more than 10 clauses, it is a better one. I prefer short questions covering only three or four clauses. That is why I allow a number of supplementaries in this House. After all, all supplementaries in respect of a question, cannot be exhausted. Only important supplementaries may have to be put.

*Sri N. RACHIAH (Hunsur-Scheduled Castes).—Sir, with regard to questions, as you were pleased to refer to the system prevailing in Parliament, I have to say that my experience in Parliament was that only three questions for oral answers are allowed in the case of each member. In all other cases, if the Member exceeds three questions, then they will be automatically converted into unstarred questions and they will be printed and they go directly into the proceedings of the House on that particular day. Apart from that, Sir, in order to avoid more number of supplementaries, Hon'ble Members may be allowed to put more number of supplementaries in the question itself; instead of writing one or two lines, they could as well write down ten lines while sending questions and get answers. In that way also, we can avoid more supplementaries. I also request you, if it is possible, with the consent of the House that the system of starred questions and unstarred questions may be introduced here also so as to enable the Members to elicit more information pertaining to the questions of local and insignificant nature. At the same time, my another submission is that, as far as possible, supplementaries on insignificant questions and questions of local nature may be avoided. That is entirely between the Chair and the respective Hon'ble Member. But, as far as possible, in the case of questions of national importance or of State importance, the Chair may be pleased to allow more supplementaries and in case of questions of local nature and insignificant nature, only one or two supplementaries may be allowed.

Another point I want to submit to you, Sir, is that the system here is that the Rules allow a member to send any number of questions. In Parliament, it is not so. Sir, only three questions for oral answers are allowed in Parliament. what is happening here is that one member can send 30 questions a day and get information and the other members will not be able to get the information required by them which is also of public importance. In these circumstances, while discussing the Rules framed by an expert committee on the 30th or 31st, as you have been pleased to say, all these points may be raised and we may evolve a simple and a very reasonable system and procedure which may enable each member to have his say and get the information he wants.

Sri D. DEVARAJ URS (Hunsur).—May I make a suggestion with regard to this point? Sir, Before deciding the issue about supplementaries to be put here, I would suggest that you may hear all the Hon'ble Members once for all giving them opportunities to give their suggestions whatever it is, and then finally come to a decision.

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—I wanted to submit something about questions though not on the question of supplementaries. It pertains to the questions that have already been sent. My submission is that Government is taking advantage of the slow progress we are making and have not been furnishing answers. It is not necessary also to see that they furnish answers because there are any number of questions that we have sent and we do not know what is going to happen to them.

Sri H. K. VEERANNA GOWDH (Minister for Public Works).—Sir, may I submit that questions which are ready with answers are not taken in the House. There is no question of want of answers on the part of Government.

Sri M. RAMAPPA (Harihar).—Sir, this is a State Legislature and it is concerned with problems of local nature. We are not concerned with national and international questions. So I request you to kindly allow more questions on matters of local nature

Mr. SPEAKER.—I need not give any reply, at this stage, to the points raised by Hon'ble Members. But in substance, I agree with Sri Rachiah. He has explained the procedure in Parliament. I have also seen how that procedure is working in Parliament. There, in the Parliament, supplementaries are few and far between. But here, supplementaries are very many. I have no objection to allow a long question covering about 10 or 15 or 20 clauses. I did not allow it now because that was not the practice here. In fact, I like this partice because this practice is such that we can finish the question within a few clauses. In Bombay, it used to be a headache as the question covered a number of clauses. Any way, this question will come before the House on the 31st July and Hon'ble Members may decide what course I should take. I am also aware that the number of questions have also increased. They have gone up to 1,600. No doubt it is an alarming figure. It usually happens in the first year. It may not happen in subsequent years. Generally during the first year, there is enthusiasm in members. As members get themselves used to Parliamentary procedure, they also realise what questions they should ask and what questions they should not ask.

Election of the Deputy Speaker

Sri G. VENKATAI GOWDA (Kollegal).—With your permission Sir, I move.—

> "That Shri C. J. Muckannappa be elected as Deputy Speaker of the House."

Sri M. C. NARASIMHAN (Kolar Gold Fields).—Sir, while seconding the motion, I would like to submit that it is necessary that, so far as the Deputy Speaker is concerned, a member from the Opposition group should be accommodated by the Congress Party. I may also submit in this connection, Sir, that it would not merely redound to the credit of the Congress Party, but it would be in accordance with what their brethren elsewhere have done, namely, in Uttar Pradesh. In Uttar Pradesh, even the Speaker has been taken from the Opposition. So, Sir, I need not go on at length into this question. I would appeal to the Congress Party and the members of the Congress Party to see that at least the Deputy Speaker is selected from the Opposition so that after the next election, the Speaker himself can be from the Opposition.

Mr. SPEAKER.—motion moved -

> "That Shri C. J. Muckannappa be elected Deputy Speaker of the Legislative Assembly"

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY (Bangalore South).—Sir, I rise to a point of order. The first point is that the mover of the motion Shri G. Venkate Gowda is not in his seat.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I have given him permission to shift himself to another seat yesterday.

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—Secondly, the seconder of the motion has made a submission by way of canvassing which is forbidden according to rules. I want a ruling from the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Who canvassed ?

Sri A. V. NARASIMHA REDDY.—The Seconder of the motion submitted that the Ruling party should be accommodative and he made a speech in a way which amounts to canvassing here in this House. I want a ruling from the Chair.

Mr. SPEAKER.—I do not think it is canvassing. It is only expressing one's views. An Hon'ble Member may express his views. There is nothing wrong in it.

(*Sri B. K. Puttaramiya rose.*)

Sri ALUR HANUMANTHAPPA (Nelamangala).—On a point of order, Sir. Proposals have not yet been completely submitted. My submission to the Chair is that after all the proposals are brought before the House, the members may speak.

Mr. SPEAKER.—Since it is a motion, any other member can speak. Before I dispose of this motion, I cannot take the other.